U. S.
National League for the Protection of the Family.
HQ824.A4

THE NATIONAL

DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE.

REPORTS

—FOR—

Year Ending, December 31, 1886.

MONTPELIER:
VERMONT WATCHMAN & STATE JOURNAL PRESS.
1887.

THE

National Divorce Reform League.

PRESIDENT:

The Rt. Rev. Benjamin H. Paddock, D. D., Boston.

VICE PRESIDENTS:

Rev. Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D., Newton, Mass.

Hon. Nathaniel Shipman, LL. D., Hartford, Conn.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Prof. George Harris, D. D., Andover, Mass.

Rev. G. L. Demarest, D. D., Manchester, N. H.

Pres. M. H. Buckham, D. D., Burlington, Vt.

Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, New Haven, Conn.

Rev. W. V. Morrison, D. D., Providence, R. I.

Rev. G. S. Dickerman, Amherst, Mass.

Pres. G. D. B. Pepper, D. D., Waterville, Maine.

Hon. Theodore W. Dwight, LL. D., New York.

Rev. B. K. Pierce, D. D., Boston.

Rev. James DeNormandie, Roxbury, Mass.

Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Royalton, Vt.

TREASURER:

William G. Benedict, Esq., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

RECORDING SECRETARY:

Rev. F. Barrows Makepeace, Andover, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY:

Rev. Samuel W. Dike, Auburndale, Mass.

THE

National Divorce Reform League.

REPORTS

—FOR—

Year Ending December 31st, 1886.

MONTPELIER:
VERMONT WATCHMAN AND STATE JOURNAL PRESS.
1887.

The National Divorce Reform League.

Its Annual Reports for the Year Ending Dec. 31, 1886.

THE FOLLOWING EXTRACT IS MADE FROM THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

The income of the Society for 1886 was $1,448.95 from which all current expenses and the salary of the Secretary were paid. It is desirable that the amount for 1887 may be not less than $2000, in order that the Secretary may make his residence near Boston and the Society gain the advantages of a central location. The Society is also indebted to Mr. Dike for nearly $1,200, on salary for the two years preceding 1885. The least amount needed for the current year is $3,200, and it is hoped that many, in addition to their usual contributions will add something this year for the liquidation of the debt. One gentleman has promised to pay the last one hundred dollars if the whole amount is pledged reasonably soon.

The annual report of the Executive Committee concludes as follows: "We take pleasure in mentioning the singular efficiency of the Corresponding Secretary, Mr. Dike, in prosecuting the work of this Society. He merits the highest praise for accomplishing so much morally and sociologically out of so little support materially. From this time on it will be found that the work the Society does through his services is of a different sort from the earlier work. Hitherto the League has been effective chiefly in awakening and even creating interest in the institution of the Family. That interest is now so general and intelligent that our work in the future will consist more and more in directing effort into the proper channels, and making it effective in tangible results. For this guidance it is important that there should be accurate knowledge of social conditions, and the effects of recent legislation, together with a

sound judgment for recommending new methods. We believe no man in the country can be so useful in this respect as our Corresponding Secretary."

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The amount of work done the past year has been lessened by the lack of funds. For the first nine months of the year, the receipts were less than eight hundred dollars and the movements of your Secretary were necessarily restricted. Still, when opportunities for important work came which it seemed to him should be improved, they were used. The larger receipts of the last few months have enabled him to do more. A brief summary of work and a sketch of the more important of the tangible results and movements connected with our work for the year will make up the body of this report.

As usual our work is of two kinds—educational and legislative. I speak first of the former ; and this again falls under two heads. For part of it is the direct work of the League and part is indirectly due to the League, through the outside work of its Corresponding Secretary, and in turn part of this latter comes of the interest excited by the League and other agencies in the Family and sociological subjects. And farther still, we are in the very center of a great social movement, so that the drawing of distinct lines is not easy, were it necessary.

Educational Work of the Year.—Considerable of this educational work is done through private correspondence and in the distribution of publications and references to the sources of information. Clergymen, editors, legislators, professors in the higher institutions and their students, are frequent in their applications for information, and the League has become the means of intercommunication for those interested in the welfare of the Family. Consultation with committees and other parties interested in reformatory work, whether educational or legislative, have taken place during the year with good results.

Within the year the Corresponding Secretary has lectured in theological seminaries in Boston, Cambridge, Chicago, New Brunswick, N. J., in the law school of the Boston University, before the Philosophical Society of the University of Michigan including an attendance of large numbers of law students, in

Detroit, Philadelphia and Washington (twice) and addressed several religious conventions.

In January, the clergy of Washington and vicinity resolved on a line of action looking to a reform in the marriage and divorce laws of the District of Columbia. While in Washington at that time, opportunity was taken to accept a previous invitation of Gen. Armstrong to give four or five lectures and conversations at the Hampton Institute, on various topics connected with the Family. With the aid of charts and the blackboard, elementary lessons were given on the place of the Family in the structure of Society, and on the forms of the typical communities in the various stages of social development, and the work and perils of society through the Family were shown. I think the instruction was well understood; certainly I have never seen in similar schools in the North a better or seemingly more appreiative interest in those lessons in primary social institutions. Several addresses on the social structure of the field of the church have been given. These sought to incite pastors and others to some scientific knowledge of those social institutions which directly affect their work and which depend on the true conception and use of the Family for their best results. The Home Department of the Sunday School, as it is called, which I suggested two or three years ago as a practical application of a sociological principle, has made rapid progress the past year, some hundreds of schools now having successful departments for the use of the Home in reaching families beyond the pale of the ordinary work of the school. Since the visit to Hampton, Va., a thousand persons have been enlisted in this use of the Home immediately around that remarkable institution. The special interest of this plan for us lies in the significance of it as a beginning, though it be in a single thing out of several, of a great work that needs doing to make the Family effective as a Christian force, and particularly as a means of reaching that large part of our population which lives beyond easy reach of present Christian organizations. A healthy religious activity of the Home is a powerful corrective of the evils our League aims to remedy. It may be added here that a statistical survey of 44 towns in Vermont which was suggested and urged by your Secretary, and which was carried

out by the Rev. Henry Fairbanks, Ph. D., of St. Johnsbury, Vt., at great expense of time and money on the part of the latter gentleman, has been made. It throws strong light on the condition of the home in the back neighborhoods of country towns and the need of putting the Family at its appropriate work as the most feasible means of Christian work in them. A paper was read before the American Congress of Churches in Cleveland in June on a kindred theme. In this and in a short address at a Home Missionary Meeting in Saratoga the next week, statistical evidence was adduced to show that, taking the country as a whole, the people living beyond the easy reach of any church and who are consequently mainly or wholly dependent upon the Christian uses that can be made of the Family nearly, if not quite exceeds the entire city population of the country. It is in the rural counties of a State that we find the highest divorce-rate in the great majority of instances and it is from these that a large part of the growth of cities eventually comes. While this is partly outside work, so far as the League is concerned, and was often done as such, it directly aids us in preparing ground for the future. It strikes at the bad social conditions that make our work necessary.

I felt so strongly the need of a better and wide-spread knowledge of social institutions by the clergy, editors and legislators, especially as underlying our own great subject and social questions in general, that a plea was made in March in one of the Reviews for such instruction in our colleges or theological seminaries as would give this class of minds a fair elementary knowledge of the great social institutions which mould their conditions of work and shape the social problems of the times. The subject has won attention, as I know by public comments and private letters. One or two Universities have this year provided or extended special courses of study in this class of subjects. Some of the colleges, which train men for the ministry and legislation, are also considering the need. An article of mine was published in the *Homilitical Review* for November on the "The Study of Social Institutions by Country Pastors," outlining a course of study through use of the material afforded by any country village and town, and giving lists of the more accessible books needed in its pursuit.

Some discussions at the last general meeting of the American Social Science Association at Saratoga brought the Family under consideration as a large factor in industrial problems.

The Reviews and other periodicals are again publishing articles on the need of uniform divorce laws or of uniformity in the laws of marriage, divorce and polygamy. An article in the *Forum* for January, 1887, by Judge Bennett, the Dean of the Boston University Law School and a member of our Executive Committee, is the clearest and most forcible presentation of the conflicting laws of divorce and their abuses, which I have yet seen in the periodicals. It is understood that this will be followed by another from the same pen on the marriage laws of the country, while other writers in this and other Reviews will discuss still other phases of the general subject. The *New Englander*, *Methodist Review*, I am told, and others perhaps, have contained, or will soon publish articles on the subject. An able paper on the Family was read by President Hyde of Bowdoin College before the Congregational Convention of Maine and has since been reprinted. A book on the Family by Rev. and Mrs. C. F. Thwing, now of Minneapolis, has been published during the year.

Legislative Work of the Year.—The progress in legislation during the year has been considerable and the steps taken toward farther legislation are of more than usual importance. So far as I can learn, all former gains in legislation have been held, though here and there an attempt has been made to repeal some of the former laws restricting the granting of divorces. These attempts are made by those who care more for some special case of apparent hardship or for gain than they do for the interests of Society as a whole. The new marriage law of Pennsylvania has generally approved itself to the people of that State as just and eminently useful. Though its provisions are scarcely more strict than those of Massachusetts and other States, it excites needless alarm among certain classes. As was the case in Massachusetts under the differences between her marriage laws and those of Connecticut forty years ago, there is complaint that large numbers cross from Philadelphia to New Jersey and from other parts of the State into New York to be married more secretly. But this incidental evil

will probably be corrected in time, as it was in New England, through the adoption of similar laws in the adjoining States as a means of self-protection. The Bar Association of New York and some of the State Christian bodies have already asked the legislature to enact the Pennsylvania law. An intelligent public sentiment in the latter State will doubtless soon allay the fears of her people concerning any harm from the wholesome official regulations of marriages. But the moral sentiment of New Jersey and their own sense of duty on the part of clergymen, as the guardians of social interests, certainly ought to correct the evil so far as their participation in it is concerned. The report, though almost incredible, is apparently well-founded that some clergymen have converted their privilege of solemnizing marriages into a trade and have their runners at the ferries distributing bills and diagrams of the streets leading to their houses and hunting for couples with the diligence of the bunco-steerer. The clergy in all parts of the country can do much to elevate public sentiment and prevent clandestine marriages. The perils from excessive legal restrictions upon the freedom of marriage in some European countries are, indeed, serious. But the regulations of the better States among us are reasonable and should be carefully guarded and extended into others also. The concern of the State in a free, yet well-regulated ballot is, when we fairly think of it, a matter of hardly more solicitude than its interest in the security of marriage. We have everywhere urged better marriage laws. For inconsiderate marriages and hasty divorces are mutually related.

The law in Vermont, of November, 1884, requiring libels for divorce to be filed at the term of court preceding the one at which they are heard—insuring at least a delay of six months before trial, is doing good and meets with universal approval. There were 202 divorces in the state in 1884 and only 94 in 1885, and I learn the statistics for 1886 will probably not show very much increase. This is important evidence of the value of delay in this class of causes. Vermont has just provided other safeguards to the family. The state's attorneys in several counties now appear in all divorce trials and introduce evidence on behalf of the state whenever the public good shall require it.

A legal fee is prescribed for such service. Another new law guards against the misi presentation of the facts in marriage certificates. Others protect the chastity of young girls with stringent penalties and provide for the closing of the doors of court rooms whenever the interests of public morals may require it.

Massachusetts has passed a law prohibiting under penalty of fine or imprisonment the obtaining or participating in obtaining a fraudulent divorce ; also forbiding the procuring of a divorce in any other state for a resident of Massachusetts, such court not having jurisdiction according to the laws of Massachusetts. In Rhode Island I understand that the courts have adopoted some stricter rules of procedure. This State in 1884 granted one divorce to every 9.6 marriages.

Some movements in behalf of better legislation have been begun, or continued, with favorable outlook. The clergy of Philadelphia, Washington and Minneapolis, and a special committee of the Bar Association of Ohio, have all taken up the divorce laws under which they live with purposes of reform. The governor of Connecticut alludes to what he calls the disgraceful condition of that State in respect to divorce, but strangely thinks that state laws can do little to remedy the evil without national legislation.

Soon after the last annual meeting I went to Washington and renewed suggestions made earlier to the President, Attorney General and Secretary of State concerning the collection of statistical information in this country and Europe relating to divorce and other matters pertaining to the Family. An amendment to the appropriation bill to enable the Bureau of Labor to collect statistics of marriage and divorce for the entire country, was made and passed in the Senate, but it unfortunately became one of the items of difference between the House and Senate and was lost, though the influence of a member of the cabinet was exerted to save it. It lacked less than a score of votes in the House. I renewed the suggestion of a year ago to the administration that congress ought to consider the condition of the marriage and divorce laws of the District of Columbia and Territories and collect the facts both for this purpose and also to throw light

upon the workings of the conflicting laws of the whole country. This need was brought before several national bodies of Christians in session about that time—five in number, Unitarians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, Free Baptists and Universalists. They all passed strong resolutions in favor of the request besides pleading for other things in our work. In two or three instances special committees were instructed to lay the object before the national authorities in person. I found in December that the member of the House hitherto most strenuous in opposition had so far modified his opinions in our favor that he offered to bring the subject before the proper committee soon. The appropriation may be granted this winter. The success of the measure is only a question of time; for public opinion is increasingly favorable to it and every one who has considered the matter with any degree of care sees that an official report of the facts as to the laws of the entire country and their effects, is essential to wise action in almost any legislation that aims at the solution of what is now recognized as a national problem of great and serious proportions. Both the legislatures of the several States and Territories and congress need this information to guide them in their respective fields. Christian and other philanthropic efforts for the Family need it, and it seems absolutely indispensable to the very beginning of any sound work on the great problem of securing uniform laws from whatever view this is approached. I have some reason to think that the administration is seriously considering the responsibility of the government for the marriage and divorce laws of the territories under the control of congress and that it earnestly desires this statistical information to direct its future course and that of Congress and the Country.

Brief Review.—Our annual meeting this year happens to fall on the sixth anniversary of the organization of the League under its first name of the New England Divorce Reform League. This occurred at the close of the Monday lecture on "Facts as to Divorce in New England" which was given the same day, January 24, 1881, in Tremont Temple. On looking back, we find that much has been done, though not so much as we could have accomplished had sufficient means been put into our hands. Some of the gains in legislation are noticed: No law in the

direction of increased laxity has been made in any State so far as I know. Maine, some of whose statistics were then brought out for the first time, has struck her old loose laws from her statute book and put a radically different law in its place, reducing divorces fully one-half. New Hampshire has collected her statistics and regulated the domicile of applicants for divorce. Vermont has made several changes for the better, reducing her divorces one-half and has now made still further regulations. Massachusetts has provided for an excellent collection of statistics, restricted the remarriage of divorced persons and punished fraudulent and other divorces. In Connecticut,* Rhode Island, Pennsylvania and Ohio the governors have urged reform, and in most of those States, as well as in Minnesota and the District of Columbia, organized work has been begun. New Jersey and Indiana now collect statistics of divorce. Pennsylvania has a new marriage law and the Bar Association and others in New York are urging it upon that State. Illinois forbids the advertising of divorces and Chicago has prohibited hearing divorce cases in chambers. The subject has been laid before the executive and legislative departments of the general government, and measures for the collection of full information on the marriage and divorce laws of the Country have nearly passed Congress.

But the more important gains are in public sentiment and the educational work that has been done. Besides addresses in most of the leading cities and many towns of the East and in some at the West, before legislatures, clubs, conventions and societies, lectures have been given by the Corresponding Secretary—in some instances from three to eight times and to successive classes—in universities, law schools, theological seminaries, colleges or in college towns, in Andover, Amherst, Boston, Cambridge, Newton, Dartmouth, Williams, Hartford, Yale, Columbia, Union Seminary, Princeton, New Brunswick, John Hopkins, Chicago, Ann Arbor, besides lesser institutions. Some instances have come to my knowledge in which students hearing these lectures have entered upon special studies on

* Connecticut repealed her notorious 'omnibus clause' in 1878, but this and two amendments of the law of Vermont that year were largely due to the present members of the League and were the beginning of the legislative reform now in progress.

account of the interest then awakened. I know of two of these who are now pursuing special studies in Europe.

The national bodies of Christians in this country, with perhaps a single, but unintentional exception of any great denomination, have gratefully recognized our subject or our work, or both. Some hopeful work has been begun in the direction of the better use of the home. Hundreds of Sunday-schools now have home departments for those who cannot go to church. Hundreds of articles have been printed in the newspapers, a score or two in the Reviews, and now books bearing on the subject are beginning to appear. Our work receives respectful and often deeply sympathetic consideration at the hands of statesmen, while it gains an increasing respect in the minds of the most eminent scholars in political science, though these have been our friends from the very first.

But we are still at the very beginning. Our membership and work need to be extended into the West and the South. Some systematic means of publishing and distributing information should be provided touching the more practical parts of our work. But beyond this, there is a great work to be done through the publishing-houses of the several Christian bodies, or through some co-operative agency of a character that will enlist the support of all—possibly our own Society, by which the popular mind may be educated in the nature, functions, perils and needs of the Family. For one I am convinced that the relations of the Family to the common school, as well as to the work of religious education, and to the problems of capital and labor, will soon demand far more attention than they now receive. The events of these six years since our organization have greatly emphasized the statements made that day, of the interdependence of Property and the Family. The studies of the scholars of Europe and America in the history of social institutions, the springing up within these few years of special studies and special publications on topics closely related to our work and the practical work of the Christian church, are abundant corroborative proofs of the timeliness of our organization.

On account of the slender receipts, general expenses were incurred in 1886 including traveling, printing, etc., to the amount of only $378.90 in all.

The total receipts for the year ending December 31, 1886, were $1448.95 of which $128.00 were received for lectures or for their expenses. The contributions for the year are printed by order of the League. Many of these have come from annual contributors.

SAMUEL W. DIKE,
Corresponding Secretary.

January 24, 1887.

NOTE.—Receipts and pledges in 1887 up to Feb. 10, have been received to the amount of nearly five hundred dollars. It is important that all our friends so far as possible, send their contributions towards the $3,200 needed to WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, TREASURER, 610 ATLANTIC AVENUE, BOSTON, *immediately;* or when this cannot be done they should inform the Corresponding Secretary what may be expected from them during the year.

Receipts of the National Divorce Reform League for the year ending Dec. 31, 1886.

January	4	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D. D., Manchester, N. H.	$ 10 00
	5	Fourth Baptist Church, Boston, Mass	5 00
	6	Rt. Rev. H. A. Neely, D. D., Portland, Me.	5 00
	8	Miss Augusta Moore, So. Yarmouth, Mass.	5 00
	8	William G. Benedict, Esq., Boston	10 00
	10	Rt. Rev. Benj. H. Paddock, D. D., Boston	20 00
	13	Hon. Frederick Billings, Woodstock, Vt	50 00
	20	George Clendon, Esq., Buckner's Station, Va	25 00
	20	Rev. H. W. Foote, D. D., Boston	10 00
	20	Rev. B. K. Pierce, D. D., Boston	5 00
	30	Gen. S. C. Armstrong, Hampton, Va.	10 00
Feb'y	10	Prof. William Lawrence, Cambridge, Mass	15 00
	11	Rev. F. B. Makepeace, Andover, Mass	5 00
	11	Hon. Edward I. Thomas, Brookline, Mass	10 00
	11	Rev. George A. Jackson, Swampscott, Mass	20 00
	24	Rev. J. L. Fonda, Rantoul, Ill	5 00
March	3	First Congregational Church, Norwich, Ct	6 00
	3	Grace Church, New York, through Rev. W. D. Huntington, D. D	100 00
	24	Charles A. Peabody, M. D., Worcester, Mass	10 00
April	1	Rev. F. H. Johnson, Andover, Mass	20 00
	3	Rev. T. T. Munger, New Haven, Ct	5 00
	3	Rev. W. H. H. Moore, Hartford, Ct	1 45
	3	Pres. G. D. B. Pepper, D. D., Waterville, Me	1 00
	26	H. O. Houghton, Esq., Boston.	5 00
	29	Rev. D Converse, Philadelphia	1 00
	29	Miss Augusta Moore, So. Yarmouth, Mass	2 00
	30	Christ Church, Hartford, Ct., through Rev. W. F. Nichols	15 00
May	2	Hon. Felix R. Brunot, Pittsburg, Pa	25 00
	5	Rev. C. L. Woodworth, D. D., Boston	5 00
	6	Rev. A. B. Hunter, Denver, Col	50
	15	Rev. E. M. Parker, Concord, N. H.	4 00
	18	Hon. N. Shipman, LL. D., Hartford, Ct.	25 00
	20	E. R. Brown, Esq., Dover, N. H	5 00
	31	Rev. Charles A. Perry, Randolph. Vt	2 00
June	14	Rev. W. S. Rainsford, D. D., New York	50 00
	14	Hon. Philip L. Moen, Worcester, Mass	50 00
	29	George H. Corliss, Esq., Providence, R. I	10 00
	29	Prof. T. W. Dwight, LL. D., New York	25 00
July	2	Prof. L. O. Brastow, D. D., New Haven, Ct.	10 00
	5	Rev. Arthur Brooks, New York	10 00
	13	Joseph Cook, Boston	5 00
	13	Rev. J. H. Dennison, D. D., Williamstown, Mass	10 00

July 14	Robert D. Benedict, Esq., New York	10 00
August 4	George Douglass Miller, Esq., Albany, N. Y	10 00
4	Rev. E. E. Stevens, Mentor, Ohio	1 00
11	W. W. Lockwood, Esq., Springfield, Mass	10 00
Sept. 21	Geo. C. Shattuck, M. D., Boston	20 00
17	Edwin Ginn, Esq	5 00
23	Prof. Wm. Thompson, D. D., Hartford, Ct	5 00
24	Hon. Edward Conant, Randolph, Vt	10 00
25	Rev. G. L. Dickerman, Amherst, Mass	15 00
25	Hon. Edward Hale, Newbury, Vt	5 00
28	Rev. Dean Geo. Z. Gray, D. D., Cambridge, Mass	10 00
Octob'r 6	Prof. Simeon E. Baldwin, New Haven, Ct	50 00
12	Hon. Edmund H. Bennett, LL. D., Boston	10 00
14	Hon. George F. Edmunds, Burlington, Vt	10 00
Nov. 3	Rev. E. E. Strong, Boston	2 00
3	St. Paul's Church, Boston, by Rev. F. D. Courtney, D.D.	25 00
5	Rev. E. K. Alden, D. D., Boston	10 00
5	Miss Augusta Moore, Wiscasset, Me	5 00
13	Rt. Rev. W. H. A. Bissell, D. D., Burlington, Vt	10 00
Dec. 1	Rev. George A. Gordon, Boston	10 00
1	Samuel Johnson, Esq., Boston	10 00
1	Rev. G. L. Demarest, D, D., Manchester, N. H	10 00
8	Trinity Church, Boston, through Rev. Phillip Brooks, D.D	100 00
9	King's Chapel, Boston, through Rev. H. W. Foote, D. D., (balance of collection)	80 00
9	Hon. P. C. Cheney, Manchester, N. H	20 00
9	Rev. Henry Fairbanks, Ph. D., St. Johnsbury, Vt	20 00
11	Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, LL. D., New Haven, Ct	50 00
18	Asylum Hill, Congregational Church, Hartford, Ct	25 00
18	Rev. D. L. Furber, D. D., Newton Center, Mass	5 00
21	Rev. Morgan Dix, D. D., New York	25 00
21	First Congregational Church, Hyde Park, Mass	10 00
22	Shawmut Congregational Church, Boston	50 00
22	Rev. Daniel Merriman, D. D., Worcester,	10 00
31	Hon. Samuel B. Capen, Boston	10 00
31	Hon. Ezra Farnsworth, Boston	20 00
31	Rev. S. P. Leeds, D. D., Hanover, N. H	15 00
	For lectures or their expenses	128 00
	Add one uncredited contribution in 1885	15 00
	Total receipts for the year	$1,448 95

CONSTITUTION

—OF THE—

National Divorce Reform League.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE.

ART. II. Its object shall be to promote an improvement in public sentiment and legislation on the institution of the Family, especially as affected by existing evils relating to Marriage and Divorce. It may co-operate with auxiliary or other bodies having similar aims in such ways as may be deemed expedient.

ART. III. It shall consist of the following persons, having power to fill vacancies and to add to their number: . . . .

ART. IV. The officers of this Society shall be a President, not more than five Vice Presidents, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, a Treasurer, and an Executive Committee of not more than twelve persons, of which Committee the Corresponding Secretary shall be a member, and of which not less than three shall constitute a quorum, having the duties indicated in their several offices: to be elected at the annual meeting, and to hold office until their successors are appointed.

ART. V. The LEAGUE shall hold its annual meeting on the first Wednesday in January, unless otherwise directed by the Executive Committee, and at such hour and place as shall be indicated in the call of the Committee.

ART. VI. Amendments of this Constitution, of which due notice shall have been given in the call of any annual meeting, may be adopted at such meeting by the vote of two-thirds of the members present.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS concerning the work of the LEAGUE and its general business should be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, REV. SAMUEL W. DIKE, ROYALTON, VT., and after April 1, 1887, AUBURNDALE, MASS.

CONTRIBUTIONS should be sent to the Treasurer, WILLIAM G. BENEDICT, ESQ., 610 Atlantic Avenue, Boston.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

I hereby give and bequeath to the NATIONAL DIVORCE REFORM LEAGUE, a Corporation created by the laws of the State of Connecticut, or its successor or assigns, the sum of_____dollars, the principal [or income as may be desired] of which is to be used for the purposes for which said Corporation was chartered.